

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/644,931	08/21/2003	Cheol-Min Jeon	1349.1271	7373	
21171 75	590 11/14/2006		· EXAMINER		
STAAS & HA	LSEY LLP		SINGH, RAM	NANDAN P	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YO	RK AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2614		
			DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006	DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/644,931		JEON, CHEOL-MIN
		Examiner		Art Unit
		Ramnandan S	ingh	2614
The I	MAILING DATE of this communica	ation appears on the co	er sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTEI WHICHEVE - Extensions of t after SIX (6) M - If NO period fo - Failure to reply Any reply rece	NED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL time may be available under the provisions of 3 ONTHS from the mailing date of this communion reply is specified above, the maximum statute within the set or extended period for reply will tived by the Office later than three months after term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS (37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, hi ication. ory period will apply and will exp), by statute, cause the application	COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be tin ire SIX (6) MONTHS from in to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status				
2a)☐ This a 3)☐ Since	ction is FINAL . 2b) this application is in condition for in accordance with the practice	☐ This action is non-f	formal matters, pro	
Disposition of (,,	,	
4a) Of 5) ☐ Claime 6) ☑ Claime 7) ☐ Claime 8) ☐ Claime	(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the app the above claim(s) is/are (s) is/are allowed. (s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected. (s) is/are objected to. (s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consid		
Application Par	pers			
10)☐ The dra Applica Replac	ecification is objected to by the Eawing(s) filed on is/are: a int may not request that any objection ement drawing sheet(s) including the thor declaration is objected to be) accepted or b) conto the drawing(s) be he e correction is required if	eld in abeyance. See the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 3	35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	vledgment is made of a claim for b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority do Certified copies of the priority do Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been re cuments have been re the priority documents I Bureau (PCT Rule 17	ceived. ceived in Applicati have been receive (.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage
2) ☐ Notice of Draft 3) ☑ Information Di	erences Cited (PTO-892) Isperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- sclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Iail Date <u>May 04, 2006</u> .	5) [Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/644,931 Page 2

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on Aug. 14, 2006 has been entered.

2. Preliminary Amendment and Request for Interview

The Preliminary amendment filed on Aug. 14, 2006 is approved.

Further, as per Applicant's request for interview before issuance of a first Office action, the personal interview with the Applicant's representative, Stephen T. Boughner, Attorney for Applicant, was held at 2:00 PM on Nov. 3, 2006 in the Office of the Examiner in Knox Building, 501 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314 to discuss the Final rejection issued on March 14, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

⁽b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-12, 17-20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kingen et al [US 4,496,799].

Regarding claim 1, Kingen et al teach a communication apparatus having a oneway speakerphone operation shown in Fig. 1, comprising:

a handset connected to the communication apparatus by a transmit-receive line, for a two-way communication operation, wherein the transmit-receive line is enabled when the handset of the communication apparatus is off-hook [col. 2, lines 35-49];

a speaker outputting a sound of the handset communication, to implement the one-way speakerphone operation (one-way speakerphone operation implies muting of Rx or Tx) [col. 3, lines 5-18];

an input key (keypad K1) part comprising a selection key for the one-way speakerphone operation and a plurality of dial keys for a dialing of the communication apparatus; and

a central control device (i.e. logic circuit) controlling the one-way speakerphone operation of the speaker [;

wherein a conversation signal is transmitted through the speaker in response to the handset being off-hook, the one-way speakerphone operation selection key signal being input, and dialing having being completed [col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 21; col. 2, line 35 to col. 5, line 7; claims 5, 7].

Application/Control Number: 10/644,931

Art Unit: 2614

Claims 6, 22, 23 are essentially similar to claim 1 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 3, Kingen et al teach a method of controlling a communication apparatus having a one-way speakerphone operation shown in Fig. 1, the method comprising:

detecting whether a handset, for a two-way communication operation, and connected to the communication apparatus through a transmit/receive line, is off-hook [col. 2, lines 35-49];

detecting whether a signal of a one-way speakerphone operation selection key in an input key (keypad K1) part of the communication apparatus is input;

opening the transmit-receive line of the handset upon detection of the handset being off-hook and the one-way speakerphone selection key signal is input;

detecting whether a signal of a dial key, for a dialing of the communication apparatus, in the input key part is input within a predetermined time [col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 4; claim # 1];

determining whether a dialing is completed [claim 5]; and

upon determining that the dialing has been completed, opening a line connected to a speaker of the communication apparatus and performing a one-way speakerphone operation to output a sound through the speaker during the handset conversation [col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 21; col. 2, line 35 to col. 5, line 7; claims 1, 5].

Claim 17 is essentially similar to claim 6 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 2, Kingen et al further teach the communication apparatus having a one-way speakerphone, wherein when the dial key signal is not input within a predetermined time of the handset being off-hook and with the one-way speakerphone function selection key signal being input, the central control device switches to an on-hook dial mode in which a user dials with the handset being on-hook, and the conversation signal is output through the speaker for a two-way speaker operation [col. 6, lines 13-41].

Claim 4 is similar to claim 2 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claims 5, 18-20, the limitations are shown above.

Regarding claim 7, Kingen et al further teach the communication apparatus, wherein the transmit-receive line is enabled when the handset is off-hook [col. 2, lines 35-39].

Regarding claim 8, Kingen et al further teach the communication apparatus

comprising an input key part (keypad K1) comprising a selection key for the one-way speakerphone operation of the speaker and a plurality of dial keys [Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 31-65].

Regarding claims 9-12, the limitations are shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 6. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingen et al [US 4,496,799] in view of Lipton et al [US 5,991,398].

Regarding claim 21, Kingen et al a device to perform a process of controlling a communication apparatus shown in Fig. 1, the process comprising:

opening a transmit-receive line of a handset, connected to the communication apparatus for a two-way communication, when the handset is taken off-hook [col. 2, lines 35-49];

determining whether a one-way speakerphone mode has been selected (selection key is pressed); and

upon determining that a dialing of the communication apparatus has been completed [col. 2, line 67 to col. 3, line 4; claim # 1], opening a line connected to a speaker of the communication apparatus and performing the one-way speakerphone operation to output a sound through the speaker during the handset two-way communication [col. 1, line 62 to col. 2, line 21; col. 2, line 35 to col. 5, line 7; claims 1, 5].

Kingen et al do not teach expressly using a machine-readable storage storing information to enable a device to perform the method.

Lipton et al teach a machine-readable storage storing information to enable a device to perform a method [col. 10, lines 56-64; col. 12, lines 33-48; col. 14, lines 36-57; col. 16, lines 24-42].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Lipton et al with Kingen et al in order to automate the process for speedy execution [Lipton et al; col. 10, lines 56-64].

7. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingen et al as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Lipton et al [US 5,991,398].

Regarding claims 15-16, Kingen et al do not teach expressly the communication apparatus comprising a memory device that stores user data and a program for the control device.

Lipton et al teach the communication apparatus comprising a memory device that stores user data and a program for the control device, wherein the memory device comprises a ROM and a DRAM [col. 10, lines 56-64; col. 12, lines 33-48; col. 14, lines 36-57; col. 16, lines 25-42].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Lipton et al with Kingen et al in order to automate the process for speedy execution [Lipton et al; col. 10, lines 56-64].

8. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingen et al as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Parks et al [US 5,877,746 A].

Regarding claims 13-14, Kingen et al do not teach expressly using a personal computer interface.

Parks et al teach a communication apparatus comprising a personal computer

interface coupling a personal computer (42) to the control device, wherein the personal computer interface interfaces the communication apparatus and the personal computer to transmit information there between [Figs. 4, 17; col. 6, line 50 to col. 7, line 46].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Parks et al with Kingen et al in order to integrate the system using the computer interface [Parks et al; col. 6, lines 50-64].

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on Aug, 14, 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- (i) Kim [US 5,982,880] teach a speakerphone in which the communication path of a microphone is controlled using a switch (60) [Whole document]; and
- (ii) Barkat et al [US 5,805,672] teach conducting conversation using either a handset or a hands-free conversation unit 32 [Figs. 1-4; col. 5, lines 48-64].

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramnandan Singh Examiner

Art Unit 2614